

R E M A R K S

Careful review and examination of the subject application are noted and appreciated.

SUPPORT FOR CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Support for amended claims 1, 14 and 15 can be found in the drawings as originally filed, for example, on FIGS. 2 and 4. As such, no new matter was added. Support for new claim 21 can be found in the specification as originally filed, for example, on page 14, lines 21-22 and on page 15, lines 1-2. As such no new matter was added.

Changes to claims 6, 7, 16, 17 and 18 were made for clarification purposes. As such, no new matter was added.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

The rejection of claims 1-3, 6-12 and 14-16 under 35 U.S.C. §102(c) as being anticipated by Hamdi is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn.

Hamdi discloses a host modem having a peripheral codec powered by a peripheral bus (Title).

In contrast, the present invention provides an apparatus comprising a transceiver circuit. The transceiver circuit comprises a multiplexer circuit and a plurality of bus input/outputs (I/Os). The transceiver circuit may be configured to

directly couple (i) an analog signal to the bus I/Os with the multiplexer circuit when the bus I/Os are in a first state and (ii) a plurality of first digital signals to the bus I/Os with the multiplexer circuit when the bus I/Os are in a second state. Claims 14 and 15 provide similar limitations. Hamdi does not disclose such a method or apparatus.

In particular, Hamdi fails to disclose a transceiver circuit configured to couple an analog signal to the bus I/Os with a **multiplexer circuit**. Additionally, Hamdi fails to disclose a transceiver circuit configured to directly couple a plurality of first digital signals to the bus I/Os with the **multiplexer circuit**. The Office Action asserts that the computer 102 as shown in FIG. 1 of Hamdi is the presently claimed multiplexer circuit (see Office Action, page 3). Clearly, the computer 102 in Hamdi is not the presently claimed multiplexer circuit. Hamdi merely discloses that a computer 102 couples a modem codec board 104 via a USB bus 106 (column 11, lines 30-34). Applicants' representative has performed a search in Hamdi for any reference to a multiplexer. No references to a "multiplexer" were found in Hamdi. Therefore, Hamdi does not disclose or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited references and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the Office Action asserts that the host controller 114 in Hamdi is the presently claimed transceiver circuit configured to directly couple an analog signal to the bus I/Os (see Office Action, page 2). However, in review of Hamdi, the analog signal is coupled to a hybrid circuit 122 and not the USB bus 106. The host controller 114 of Hamdi fails to directly couple the analog signal to the USB bus 106. Moreover, the host controller 114 and the USB bus 106 in Hamdi are configured to receive and transmit **only** digital data (see column 11, lines 63-66). The host controller 114 in Hamdi cannot be the presently claimed transceiver circuit. Hamdi fails to disclose or suggest each and every element of the presently claimed invention as arranged in the present claims. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Finally, the Office Action fails to address how Hamdi discloses the presently claimed first state and second state. The Office Action relies on column 11, line 42 through column 12, line 7 of Hamdi to support the assertion that Hamdi discloses the presently claimed first state and second state. However, in review of Hamdi, no reference is made to the presently claimed first state and second state. Therefore, the Office Action does not appear to meet the Office's burden to (i) factually establish that a single prior art reference discloses or suggests each and every element of

the presently claimed invention, arranged as in the claims and (ii) clearly explain the factual basis for each claim rejected. As such, the presently claimed invention is fully patentable over the cited reference and the rejection should be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

The rejection of claims 5 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Hamdi in view of USB OTG is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn. Claim 5 depends directly on claim 1, which is now believed to be allowable. Claim 19 depends directly on claim 15, which is now believed to be allowable.

The rejection of claim 4, 13, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamdi in view of the background section of the present application is respectfully traversed and should be withdrawn. Claims 4 and 13 depend indirectly on claim 1, which is now believed to be allowable. Claims 17, 18 and 20 depend indirectly on claim 15 which is now believed to be allowable.

Accordingly, the present application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action by the Examiner is respectfully solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully invited to call the Applicants' representative should it be deemed beneficial to further advance prosecution of the application.

If any additional fees are due, please charge our office
Account No. 50-0541.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTOPHER P. MAIORANA, P.C.

Christopher P. Maiorana
Registration No. 42,829
24840 Harper Avenue, Suite 100
St. Clair Shores, MI 48080
(586) 498-0670

Dated: April 15, 2005

Docket No.: 0325.00529